

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRANDON MARCUS RESCH,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:20-cv-515

v.

Honorable Paul L. Maloney

RANDEE REWERTS,

Respondent.

OPINION

This is a habeas corpus action brought by a state prisoner under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Promptly after the filing of a petition for habeas corpus, the Court must undertake a preliminary review of the petition to determine whether “it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court.” Rule 4, Rules Governing § 2254 Cases; *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If so, the petition must be summarily dismissed. Rule 4; *see Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (district court has the duty to “screen out” petitions that lack merit on their face). A dismissal under Rule 4 includes those petitions which raise legally frivolous claims, as well as those containing factual allegations that are palpably incredible or false. *Carson v. Burke*, 178 F.3d 434, 436-37 (6th Cir. 1999). After undertaking the review required by Rule 4, the Court will dismiss the petition without prejudice for failure to exhaust available state-court remedies.

Discussion

I. Factual allegations

Petitioner Brandon Marcus Resch is incarcerated with the Michigan Department of Corrections at the Carson City Correctional Facility (DRF) in Montcalm County, Michigan. Petitioner pleaded *nolo contendere* in the Macomb County Circuit Court to unlawful use of a motor vehicle, in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws § 750.414, and breaking and entering a building, in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws § 750.110. On August 22, 2018, the court sentenced Petitioner as a fourth habitual offender, Mich. Comp. Laws § 769.12, to 6 months' to 15 years' imprisonment on the motor vehicle conviction and 6 months' to 10 years' imprisonment on the breaking and entering conviction. Those sentences, in turn, were to be served consecutively to a string of offenses for which Petitioner was on parole at the time he unlawfully used the motor vehicle and broke into and entered the building. The accumulation of Petitioner's various maximum sentences yields a maximum discharge date of January 24, 2073.¹ However, as of February 21, 2019, Petitioner had already served his combined minimum sentences. He is, therefore, eligible for parole.

On June 3, 2020, Petitioner filed his habeas corpus petition. The petition purports to raise, on behalf of a class of MDOC inmates who have already served their minimum sentences, the claim that the risk of infection arising from the COVID-19 pandemic renders continued

¹ According to the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) Offender Tracking Information System (OTIS), Petitioner's "Earliest Release Date" was February 21, 2019; his maximum discharge date is January 24, 2073. See <https://mdocweb.state.mi.us/otis2/otis2profile.aspx?mdocNumber=304507> (visited June 16, 2020). This Court takes judicial notice of the information provided by a search of the MDOC OTIS website with regard to Petitioner. See, i.e., *Carpenter v. Mich. Dep't of Corr. Time Computation Unit*, No. 1:13-cv-313, 2013 WL 1947249 *1 n.1 (W.D. Mich. May 9, 2013); *Ward v. Wolfenbarger*, 323 F. Supp. 2d 818, 821-22 n. 3 (E.D. Mich. 2004).

imprisonment cruel and unusual in violation of the Eighth Amendment.² Petitioner contends that the cruelty is even more apparent in a subclass of individuals, including Petitioner, who have already served their minimum sentences and who are medically fragile. (Pet., ECF No.1, PageID.2-4.) Petitioner asks the Court to appoint counsel, certify the class and subclass, release Petitioner and the other class and subclass members, and order further relief to which he, the class, and subclass may be entitled. (*Id.*, PageID.5.)

II. Availability of § 2254 relief for unconstitutional conditions of confinement

Petitioner's request for relief is not a typical habeas petition. The Supreme Court has made clear that constitutional challenges to the fact or duration of confinement are the proper subject of a habeas corpus petition rather than a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 499 (1973). Constitutional challenges to the conditions of confinement, on the other hand, are proper subjects for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Id.* The *Preiser* Court, however, did not foreclose the possibility that habeas relief might be available even for conditions of confinement claims:

This is not to say that habeas corpus may not also be available to challenge such prison conditions. See *Johnson v. Avery*, 393 U.S. 483, (1969); *Wilwording v. Swenson*, *supra*, at 251 of 404 U.S. . . . When a prisoner is put under additional and unconstitutional restraints during his lawful custody, it is arguable that habeas corpus will lie to remove the restraints making the custody illegal. See Note, Developments in the Law—Habeas Corpus, 83 Harv. L. Rev. 1038, 1084 (1970).[]

² In *Wilson v. Williams*, ___ F.3d ___, 2020 WL 3056217 (6th Cir. June 9, 2020), the Sixth Circuit described the COVID-19 problem as follows:

The COVID-19 virus is highly infectious and can be transmitted easily from person to person. COVID-19 fatality rates increase with age and underlying health conditions such as cardiovascular disease, respiratory disease, diabetes, and immune compromise. If contracted, COVID-19 can cause severe complications or death.

Wilson, 2020 WL 3056217, at *1.

Preiser, 411 U.S. at 499 (footnote omitted).

But, the Court has also never upheld a “conditions of confinement” habeas claim. Indeed, in *Muhammad v. Close*, 540 U.S. 749 (2004), the Court acknowledged that it had “never followed the speculation in *Preiser* . . . that such a prisoner subject to ‘additional and unconstitutional restraints’ might have a habeas claim independent of § 1983” *Id.* at 751 n.1.

The Sixth Circuit has concluded that claims regarding conditions of confinement are properly brought under § 1983 and are not cognizable on habeas review. *See Martin v. Overton*, 391 F.3d 710, 714 (6th Cir. 2004) (“Petitioner in this case appears to be asserting the violation of a right secured by the federal Constitution or laws by state prison officials. Such a claim is properly brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”); *In re Owens*, 525 F. App’x 287, 290 (6th Cir. 2013) (“The criteria to which Owens refers involves the conditions of his confinement . . . This is not the proper execution of sentence claim that may be pursued in a § 2254 petition.”); *Hodges v. Bell*, 170 F. App’x 389, 392-93 (6th Cir. 2006) (“Hodges’s complaints about the conditions of his confinement . . . are a proper subject for a § 1983 action, but fall outside of the cognizable core of habeas corpus relief.”); *Young v. Martin*, 83 F. App’x 107, 109 (6th Cir. 2003) (“It is clear under current law that a prisoner complaining about the conditions of his confinement should bring suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”). Petitioner’s claims regarding the constitutionality of his custody in the prison because of risks posed by COVID-19 are principally claims regarding the conditions of his confinement. Such claims should be raised by a complaint for violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

But, the relief Petitioner seeks—release from custody—is available only upon habeas corpus review. “The Supreme Court has held that release from confinement—the remedy

petitioner[] seek[s] here—is ‘the heart of habeas corpus.’” *Wilson*, 2020 WL 3056217, at *5 (quoting *Preiser*, 411 U.S. at 498).³ A challenge to the fact or duration of confinement should be brought as a petition for habeas corpus and is not the proper subject of a civil rights action brought pursuant to § 1983. *See Preiser*, 411 U.S. at 484 (the essence of habeas corpus is an attack by a person in custody upon the legality of that custody and the traditional function of the writ is to secure release from illegal custody). Undoubtedly, for that reason, Petitioner has sought relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Petitioner’s decision to pursue relief under § 2254, however, circumscribes the relief available. *Wilson*, 2020 WL 3056217 at *5. Petitioner asks the Court to provide other relief, if appropriate. Even if there might be conditions of confinement, short of release, that would mitigate the risk—and eliminate the cruel or unusual character of the punishment—it is not within this Court’s habeas jurisdiction to grant such relief. *Id.* A claim seeking relief other than release is properly brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

III. Exhaustion of State Court Remedies

Before the Court may grant habeas relief to a state prisoner, the prisoner must exhaust remedies available in the state courts. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1); *O’Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 842 (1999). Exhaustion requires a petitioner to “fairly present” federal claims so that state courts have a “fair opportunity” to apply controlling legal principles to the facts bearing upon a petitioner’s constitutional claim. *Id.* at 844, 848; *see also Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270,

³ The *Wilson* petitioners were federal prison inmates who brought habeas claims similar to Petitioner’s claims, but under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 rather than § 2254. Petitioner, because he is in custody pursuant to the judgment of a state court, must seek relief under § 2254; and he is bound by the procedural requirements attendant to claims under § 2254. *See Rittenberry v. Morgan*, 468 F.3d 331, 333-338 (6th Cir. 2006). The *Wilson* court’s reasoning regarding the scope of habeas jurisdiction is equally applicable to a claim under § 2254.

275-77 (1971); *Duncan v. Henry*, 513 U.S. 364, 365 (1995); *Anderson v. Harless*, 459 U.S. 4, 6 (1982). To fulfill the exhaustion requirement, a petitioner must have fairly presented his federal claims to all levels of the state appellate system, including the state's highest court. *O'Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 845; *Wagner v. Smith*, 581 F.3d 410, 414 (6th Cir. 2009); *Hafley v. Sowders*, 902 F.2d 480, 483 (6th Cir. 1990). The district court can and must raise the exhaustion issue *sua sponte* when it clearly appears that habeas claims have not been presented to the state courts. *See Prather v. Rees*, 822 F.2d 1418, 1422 (6th Cir. 1987); *Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 138-39 (6th Cir. 1970).

Petitioner bears the burden of showing exhaustion. *See Rust v. Zent*, 17 F.3d 155, 160 (6th Cir. 1994). Petitioner acknowledges that he has not exhausted his claims in the state courts.⁴ Petitioner instead asks the Court to relieve him of the exhaustion requirement under § 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii). (Pet., ECF No. 1, PageID.4.) Subparagraph b of § 2254 precludes the Court from granting habeas relief unless Petitioner has exhausted his claims in state court. A petitioner's failure to exhaust may be excused if "there is an absence of State corrective process" or "circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the rights of the applicant." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1)(B). Petitioner does not claim that there is an absence of state corrective process. Petitioner invokes the latter exception: that circumstances have made the state's corrective process ineffective. But, he has failed to allege how the present circumstances have rendered state court remedies ineffective.

An applicant has not exhausted available state remedies if he has the right under state law to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(c).

⁴ Indeed, given the recency of the events giving rise to Petitioner's claim, it would appear to be impossible for Petitioner or any member of the class to have exhausted state court remedies before filing the petition on June 3, 2020.

Petitioner has at least one available procedure by which to raise the issues he has presented in this application. He may file a motion for relief from judgment under Mich. Ct. R. 6.500 *et seq.* Under Michigan law, one such motion may be filed after August 1, 1995. Mich. Ct. R. 6.502(G)(1). Petitioner has not yet filed his one allotted motion. Moreover, relief may be available to Petitioner by way of a habeas corpus petition in state court in that he seeks a determination “whether his continued custody is legal.” *Phillips v. Warden, State Prison of S. Mich.*, 396 N.W.2d 482, 486 (Mich. Ct. App. 1986). Alternatively, Petitioner may seek relief, even release, by civil action in state court for unconstitutional conditions of confinement. *See Kent Cty. Prosecutor v. Kent Cty. Sheriff*, 409 N.W.2d 202, 208 (Mich. 1987) (“No one now doubts the authority of courts to order the release of prisoners confined under conditions violating their Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.”). Therefore, the Court concludes that he has at least one available state remedy.

To properly exhaust his claim, Petitioner must present his claim to each level of the state court system. *O’Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 845; *Hafley*, 902 F.2d at 483 (“[P]etitioner cannot be deemed to have exhausted his state court remedies as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b) and (c) as to any issue, unless he has presented that issue both to the Michigan Court of Appeals and to the Michigan Supreme Court.”) (citation omitted).

Because Petitioner has failed to exhaust his claims, his petition is properly dismissed without prejudice. The habeas statute imposes a one-year statute of limitations on habeas claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). Petitioner’s period of limitation commenced running when “the factual predicate of his claim . . . could have been discovered through the exercise of reasonable diligence.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(D). Certainly, Petitioner could not have discovered his claim before February or March of this year.

The limitations period is not tolled during the pendency of a federal habeas petition. *Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 181-82 (2001). But, the period is tolled while an application for state post-conviction or collateral review of a claim is pending. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). The statute of limitations is tolled from the filing of an application for state post-conviction or other collateral relief until a decision is issued by the state supreme court. *Lawrence v. Florida*, 549 U.S. 327 (2007).

In *Palmer v. Carlton*, 276 F.3d 777 (6th Cir. 2002), the Sixth Circuit considered what action the court should take if the dismissal of a petition for failure to exhaust could jeopardize the timeliness of a subsequent petition.⁵ The *Palmer* court concluded that if the petitioner had more than 60 days remaining in the period of limitation—30 days to raise his unexhausted claims and 30 days after exhaustion to return to the court—no additional protection, such as a stay, was warranted. *Id.*; *see also Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269, 277 (2007) (approving stay-and-abeyance procedure); *Griffin v. Rogers*, 308 F.3d 647, 652 n.1 (6th Cir. 2002).

Petitioner has more than sixty days remaining in his limitations period. Assuming that Petitioner diligently pursues his state-court remedies and promptly returns to this Court after the Michigan Supreme Court issues its decision, he is not in danger of running afoul of the statute of limitations. Therefore, a stay of these proceedings is not warranted, and the Court will dismiss the petition for failure to exhaust available state-court remedies.

IV. Appointment of counsel

Indigent habeas petitioners have no constitutional right to a court-appointed attorney. *Johnson v. Avery*, 393 U.S. 483, 488 (1969); *Barker v. Ohio*, 330 F.2d 594, 594-95 (6th

⁵The *Palmer* court considered the issue in the context of a “mixed” petition including exhausted and unexhausted claims. The *Palmer* court’s explanation of when dismissal of a petition does not jeopardize the timeliness of a subsequent petition, however, is persuasive even where the petition includes only unexhausted claims.

Cir. 1964); *see also Lovado v. Keohane*, 992 F.2d 601, 604-05 (6th Cir. 1993). The Court is required by rule to appoint an attorney only if an evidentiary hearing is necessary or if the interest of justice so requires. Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

The Court has considered the complexity of the issues and the procedural posture of the case. At this stage of the case, the assistance of counsel does not appear necessary to the proper presentation of Petitioner's position. Petitioner's request for a court-appointed attorney will therefore be denied.

V. Class certification

The purpose of class action suits are judicial economy and the opportunity to bring claims that would not be brought absent the class action because it might not be economically feasible to bring them as individual claims. *See Reeb v. Ohio Dep't of Rehab. & Corr.*, 435 F.3d 639, 650 (6th Cir. 2006). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, which governs class certification, provides that:

One or more members of a class may sue ... as representative parties on behalf of all only if (1) the class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable, (2) there are questions of law or fact common to the class, (3) the claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class, and (4) the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a). The four prerequisites for class certification are respectively referred to as “numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy of representation.” *See, e.g., Daffin v. Ford Motor Co.*, 458 F.3d 549 (6th Cir. 2006); *Reeb*, 435 F.3d at 645; *Golden v. City of Columbus*, 404 F.3d 950, 965 (6th Cir. 2005); *Coleman v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 296 F.3d 443, 446 (6th Cir. 2002).

Petitioner cannot adequately represent the class or sub-class. The Sixth Circuit has explained that this adequacy of representation requirement encompasses two criteria: (1) the representative plaintiffs must have common interests with unnamed members of the class; and (2)

it must appear that the representative plaintiffs will vigorously prosecute the interests of the class through qualified counsel. *Senter v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 532 F.2d 511, 525 (6th Cir. 1976). The Fourth Circuit has held that incarcerated, *pro se* litigants are inappropriate representatives of the interests of others. *See Oxendine v. Williams*, 509 F.2d 1405, 1407 (4th Cir. 1975); *see also Sule v. Story*, No. 95-1422, 1996 WL 170156, at *1 (10th Cir. Apr. 11, 1996) (collecting cases). In numerous unpublished decisions, the Sixth Circuit has followed the Fourth Circuit's decision in *Oxendine*. *See Howard v. Dougan*, No. 99-2232, 2000 WL 876770, at *1 (6th Cir. June 23, 2000); *Ballard v. Campbell*, No. 98-6156, 1999 WL 777435, at *1 (6th Cir. Sept. 21, 1999); *Giorgio v. Tennessee*, No. 95-6327, 1996 WL 447656, at *1 (6th Cir. Aug. 7, 1996); *Marr v. Michigan*, No. 95-1794, 1996 WL 205582, at *1 (6th Cir. Apr. 25, 1996); *Barnes v. Dunn*, No. 91-5889, 1991 WL 243553, at *1 (6th Cir. Nov. 21, 1991); *Stanko v. Story*, No. 90-6549, 1991 WL 73257 (6th Cir. May 7, 1991). The Sixth Circuit has also stated that “non-attorneys proceeding *pro se* cannot adequately represent a class.” *Ziegler v. State of Michigan*, 90 F. App'x 808, 810 (6th Cir. 2004). Thus, Petitioner, as an incarcerated, *pro se* litigant, is poorly suited to represent the class and certification of the class and sub-class is not warranted.

VI. Certificate of Appealability

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the Court must also determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a “substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has disapproved issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466, 467 (6th Cir. 2001) (per curiam). Rather, the district court must “engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim” to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.*

I have concluded that Petitioner's application is properly denied for lack of exhaustion. Under *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000), when a habeas petition is denied on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability may issue only “when the prisoner shows, at least, [1] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and [2] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” Both showings must be made to warrant the grant of a certificate. *Id.*

I find that reasonable jurists could not find it debatable whether Petitioner's application should be dismissed for lack of exhaustion. Therefore, a certificate of appealability will be denied. Moreover, although Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution and has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, the Court does not conclude that any issue Petitioner might raise on appeal would be frivolous. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962).

Conclusion

The Court will enter an order and judgment dismissing the petition for failure to exhaust state-court remedies, denying the appointment of counsel, denying Petitioner's request for class certification, and denying a certificate of appealability.

Dated: June 19, 2020

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge